Spratt Thompson (CA) Visclosky Waters Watt (NC) Stabenow Thompson (MS) Stark Thurman Stenholm Tierney Weiner Strickland Towns Wexler Wevgand Stupak Turner Udall (CO) Tanner Wise Tauscher Udall (NM) Woolsey Taylor (MS) Vento Wu

#### NOT VOTING-16

Becerra Istook Watts (OK) Berman Mollohan Waxman Blilev Simpson Wvnn Brown (CA) Slaughter Young (FL) Carson Davis (FL) Tiahrt Watkins

## $\square$ 1222

Messrs. HALL of Ohio, HOLDEN and BALDACCI changed their vote from 'yea'' to ''nay.'' Mr. ROTHMAN changed his vote

from "nay" to "yea."
So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY, MAY 7, 1999, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 775, YEAR 2000 READINESS AND RE-SPONSIBILITY ACT

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight Friday, May 7, 1999, to file the report on the bill, H.R. 775, to establish certain procedures for civil actions brought for damages relating to the failure of any device or system to process or otherwise deal with the transition from the year 1999 to the year 2000, and for other purposes.

The minority has agreed.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and that I may be permitted to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 833.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NORTHWEST OHIO WATERSHEDS GIVEN HELP THROUGH ASSIST-ANCE OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT BORSKI

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I wish to state for the RECORD my sincere appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Borski) for the enormous assistance he provided our community during the consideration of the water resources bill last week.

When we were on the floor, I did not have an opportunity to place it formally in the RECORD, but I would say that without his help, Northwestern Ohio would not have received the consideration that was placed in that bill. and I wish to acknowledge and deeply thank him for the help that he gave us. Without his assistance, our watersheds would have been given no attention, and I thank him very much.

## □ 1230

### BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 158 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 833.

# □ 1230

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 833) to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for further purposes, with Mr. NETHERCUTT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Conyers) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States guarantees that bankruptcy shall be available to the citizens of our Nation. Accordingly, Congresses, ever since the first moment of our new land, have incorporated into their work special provisions to accommodate those individuals who find themselves totally engulfed by debt rather than to submit them to the prison dungeons that were the plight of people previously prior to the United States.

We, our enlightened forefathers, saw fit to allow the Congress to evolve in a situation in which a fresh start would be accorded to an ordinary citizen who cannot meet his obligations; and that is where we are here today.

We, in a long line of congressional action, re-guarantee the fresh start to individuals who become so engulfed in

debt that there is no other way except for the Government to discharge their obligations and to allow them to start all over again. We guarantee that in this bill.

But to balance that situation, we also provide in this bill a mechanism whereby if those individuals who file for bankruptcy can, after a careful screening, be placed in a situation where they could repay some of the debt over a period of years, then this bill accommodates that and allows people to be moved from Chapter 7, where they would have gotten that fresh start automatically, to Chapter 13, where they must work through a plan for repayment of some of the debt over a period of time.

Now, here is the thing that we must make clear to the opponents of bankruptcy reform and to the people of our country. We are talking about a dividing line caused by the median income. We provide that the median income shall be the dividing line.

In other words, people under the median income in our country who apply for bankruptcy almost certainly will be accorded almost automatically the fresh start which their financial circumstances dictate. But we also said that if the income is over the median income, then that set of financial circumstances should be more closely scrutinized to determine if any money can be repaid to this debt that has been accumulated. That is a very balanced and a fair way to approach the economic system of our Nation.

And what is that median income? We are talking about a median income of \$51,000 for a family of four is the starting point. So if an individual with four people in the family is earning \$30,000 or \$40,000 or \$50,000, that fresh start is guaranteed. But if they are earning \$55,000, \$60,000, \$80,000, \$100,000 or beyond, then that set of finances has to be looked at more closely under the provisions of our bill to see if anything should be used for repayment of some of the debt. That is fair. That is proper.

The more we do that, the less burden the rest of the taxpayers have to bear. Because the taxpayers have to pick up the slack. Consumers at the retail outlets, at the supermarkets, have to pay more. Interest rates go up, etc. The more we are able to recoup some of the debt from the high-income people, the less the burden will be on the rest of the public.

That is what the clear message is of the bankruptcy reform legislation which we have before the House today. I ask for an overwhelming vote in support of the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following letters: